

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2, 17 and 18 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-9, 16 and 19-25 and new Claim 26 remain active in the case.

Claims 1-9 and 16-24, 35 USC 103, Mack et al, Otaki et al, Downey, Korpman

Applicants maintain their position of record the field of technology of the present invention is not in any way related to the fields of technology of any of the four cited patents. Moreover, the fields of technology of the patents are substantially unrelated to each other with the possible exception of the Downey and Korpman patents. Downey discloses a pressure sensitive adhesive which is based on an A-B-A block copolymer. Korpman discloses a pressure sensitive adhesive which is based on an A-B-A or A-B block copolymer. Neither of the two patents, in disclosing pressure sensitive adhesives, does not disclose or suggest a multicoat system which is comprised of a topcoat that is radiation curable and an elastic intercoat which is located between the topcoat and an underlying substrate layer. Certainly neither of the two patents teaches the modified multicoat system as now claimed where the multicoat system further is comprised of at least one coat (C), which functions as a second substrate, of a polymer film, is positioned between said at least one elastic intercoat (D) and the second substrate layer (C) and with at least one elastic intercoat (D) being interposed between substrate (A) and the second substrate layer. Accordingly, the two patents are not germane to the claimed multicoat system of the present invention.

Mack et al is cumulative in its lack of relevancy to the present invention and is not related at all to the technology of the Downey and Korpman patents. Mack et al discloses a coating agent for fillers that are incorporated in polyamides. The coating agent is an organosilane and/or organosiloxane-containing agent which functions by creating greater compatibility between filler particles such as glass fibers, glass beads, wollastonite, or the

like and the polyamide into which the particles are incorporated. This disclosure in no way discloses a multicoat system as claimed in the present invention which requires a radiation curable topcoat layer and a series of underlying elastic and substrate layers..

The Otake et al patent, although disclosing a multi-layered structure, nevertheless is unrelated to the present invention, because it shows a hologram layer adhesively bonded on each side to a pressure sensitive adhesive, wherein the remaining surface of one of the adhesive layers is bonded to a substrate layer and the other adhesive layer to bonded to a top protective layer. No such structure is claimed in the present invention. Certainly the combined references do not suggest the multilayered structure of the present invention, which, as now claimed, has two substrate layers underlying the curable topcoat with elastic layers between the clear topcoat layer and the underlying substrate layers.

The rejection of Claims 1-9 and 16-24 in view of the combination of Onozawa et al, JP-‘671 (Matsuoka et al), Downey, and Korpman based on 35 USC 103.

As previously stated on the record, Onozawa et al discloses what is termed a hard coat sheet which is preferably useful for application to window panes of buildings or in car windows for the purposes of providing an anti-scattering (light) effect and a light (heat rays) shielding function. The hard coat sheet is very simply formed by coating a layer of a resin based composition on a base sheet that is usually formed of a plastic material such as polyethylene terephthalate, polycarbonate, polyethylene naphthalate, polypropylene or the like. The resin composition coated on the base sheet is comprised of 0.1 to 100 parts by wt of a radiation curable silicone resin in an amount ranging from 0.1 to 100 parts by wt per 100 parts by wt of a multi-functional acrylate. If desired, as disclosed at the bottom of column 3 of the patent, the “back” side of the base sheet can be provided with an adhesive layer that is formed from the likes of the adhesives described at column 4, lines 3-16. (The adhesive layer

does not intervene between the surface of the sheet and the radiation curable silicone resin/acrylate layer.) This adhesive layer then allows one to apply the sheet to whatever substrate desired, such as a wall in a building or a vehicle. It is therefore abundantly clear that the reference nowhere describes the laminated structure of the present invention in which an overlying radiation curable layer and a substrate are joined in juxtaposition by at least one intervening elastic intercoat layer, and still further having a second substrate layer as a polymer film between the substrate layer (A) and the elastic layer. At least one elastic layer intervenes between the substrate layer (A) and the second substrate. The patent clearly does not suggest the multilayered structure of the present invention.

The deficiencies of Onazawa et al are neither overcome nor improved by Matsuoka which merely discloses a polycarbonate sheet as a windshield. In an embodiment of the windshield plate of the reference, a windshield plate having a fog degree of 3 % or less and an impact strength of 60 kgf·cm/cm or more is obtained by bonding a thermoplastic resin film to the polycarbonate. It is accordingly very clear that the two references are not only directed to unrelated fields of transparent window or glazing technology. Moreover, neither of the references is even remotely related to the technology of a clear coat system of the present invention.

The Downey and Korpman patents, which disclose pressure sensitive adhesives based on thermoplastic styrene/unsaturated diene resins and a tackifying resin component, are unrelated to the present invention which does not employ a pressure sensitive material in an embodiment of the multi-layered structure that exists as a clear coat system. The rejection is believed overcome.

Claims 1-7, 9, 17-19 and 21-24 stand rejected over Bergh et al in view of Van Havenbergh et al based on 35 USC 103.

The Bergh et al '245 publication describes a basically two-layer radiation storage panel that is comprised of a self-supporting or supported phosphor layer in which phosphor particles are dispersed in a polymeric binder, and, adjacent thereto, is a protective layer which contains a white pigment, normally titanium dioxide, having a refractive index greater than 1.6. For the preparation of the phosphor containing layer material, the polymeric materials disclosed in paragraph [0042] are employed as a binder. The active phosphor is a BaF-Br:Eu or CsBr:Eu material. The thermoplastic rubbery materials disclosed on page 4, second column of the publication constitute the binder component of the base self-supporting or supported layer which contains phosphor particles, and is not a separate layer of the laminated structure described in the publication. The rubbery material does not form the equivalent of the elastic layer of the present claims. From this description it is apparent that the reference not only does the patent not teach or suggest the multi-layer coating system of the present invention as originally claimed in Claim 1, but also as the claim now stands modified by the incorporation of original Claim 2 therein.

The Van Havenbergh et al patent pertains to the field of technology of radiographic screens, which is entirely different from the surface protective clear coat system of the present invention where applied clear coat is able to protect substrates that are subject to exterior environmental stress. The Examiner uses the Van Havenbergh et al patent for its disclosure of support materials such as cardboard, a metal or a hydrophobic resin. While such support materials function well as supports for the radiographic screen of the reference and may function as support materials upon which the present clear coat system can be applied, nevertheless, the radiographic screen of the patent is not a clear coat system of a radiation curable coating material, optionally with a pigment layer, and an under-lying elastic intercoat layer. It also certainly does not suggest the positioning of a second substrate layer via at least one elastic layer onto a base substrate layer.

In view of the comments above, it is believed clear that the invention as claimed is patentably distinguished over the prior art previously cited of record in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.  
Norman F. Oblon



---

Frederick D. Vastine, Ph.D.  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 27,013

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 07/09)